

### **REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 22-27 as unpatentable over Baillie et al. in view of Vakil and Stob.

The Examiner has stated that Baillie et al in view of Stob teaches or suggests all the elements of the instant claims and has concluded that the rim of the endcap of Stob is in frictional contact with the wall of the protective tube. Thus the Examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to provide a protective sleeve as taught by Stob as the base material to the sleeve of Baillie et al, to provide protection to the fluorescent tube and allow for the control of the direct emission of light from Baillie et al. as suggested by Stob.

Applicant has amended the claims so that they now recite that the sleeve has a first diameter and the fluorescent globe has a second diameter whereby the end piece or end cap has two portions, each with a different diameter, a first portion that approximates the first diameter of the sleeve and a second portion that approximates the second diameter of the fluorescent globe, each fitting about the respective sleeve and globe to create a friction fit therewith. Contrary to the statements of the Examiner this is not taught in the prior art. The Examiner has stated that the rim of the end cap of Stob is in frictional contact with the wall 19 of the protective tube 12. However, this is not a friction fit as Stob specifically states that "the sleeve 12 is freely rotatable about the longitudinal axis of element 26, (column 5, lines 27-29)." The Examiner has also stated that Cicarelli indicates it was also known to use an end cap secure sleeve to a fluorescent tube. However, Cicarelli does not discuss the use of an end cap having friction fit on the fluorescent light bulb. Thus neither Cicarelli nor Stob suggests or teaches the subject invention as now claimed.

Application No. 10/516,965  
Amdt. dated 30 April 2010  
Reply to Office Action of 6 January 2010

Accordingly, there is no teaching in the art that teaches or suggests an end cap or end piece having two portions, a first portion and a second portion with the first portion being smaller than the second portion and the first portion approximating the diameter of the sleeve for a friction fit and the second portion approximating the diameter of the fluorescent globe for a friction fit therewith. This double friction fit provides a tight hold of the end cap on both the sleeve and the fluorescent globe. With these differences with the prior art, Applicant believes the subject invention to be patentable as claimed.


Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

No further fee or petition is believed to be necessary. However, should any further fee be needed, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0920, and deem this paper to be the required petition.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he/she is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Application No. 10/516,965  
Amdt. dated 30 April 2010  
Reply to Office Action of 6 January 2010

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gerald T. Shekleton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Dated: 30 April 2010

Gerald T Shekleton  
Reg. No. 27,466  
Husch Blackwell Sanders Welsh & Katz  
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Phone: (312) 655-1511  
Fax: (312) 655-1501